

*Spence Bate Esq.*  
*F. S. A. &c.*

O G H A M I C A ; *Plymouth*

*With the compliments*  
IN *of the writer*

*Dublin, 1873.*

A LETTER TO J. G. A. PRIM, ESQ.

(4)

BY

SAMUEL FERGUSON, LL.D.

A REPRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, FROM THE  
"JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATION OF IRELAND."

DUBLIN:

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,  
BY M. H. GILL.

1873.



# THE OGHAM MONUMENTS OF KILKENNY,

WITH

REMARKS ON CERTAIN OGHAM FORMULAS,

IN A LETTER TO JOHN G. A. PRIM, ESQ.

BY

SAMUEL FERGUSON, LL.D.

---

20 *North Great George's-street,*  
*Dublin, 2nd September, 1872.*

DEAR SIR,—Having been permitted, through your kindness, to obtain paper-casts of the Ogham-inscribed stones in the Kilkenny Museum, I have taken the opportunity to have them made in duplicate, and now beg leave, through you, to present one set to your Society. I present, in addition, a similar reproduction of the Gowran inscription, but regret that the position of that at Claragh prevents my obtaining a paper cast of it, also, for your Museum.

These casts possess the advantage of being easily handled, and turned to the light; and the uniform colour of the surface aids the eye in detecting shallow indentations. Well executed, they possess all the qualities of casts in plaster, with lightness superadded. [The facility of adjustment to a favourable light has enabled me, since the printing of this paper in its original form, to supply photographic reproductions, on the next pages, of the Dunbel inscriptions noticed below. The indentations on the casts have not received any treatment to bring them out; and the adjustment to the light has been so favourable that all are apparent; so that, for the first time, the reader may here look upon perfectly complete and authentic reproductions in print of two of these legends. I have been induced to this course by observing that the same issue of the “*Journal*” contains a paper in which the Dunbel inscriptions receive a transliteration differing from mine.]

I have deposited upwards of thirty such casts in the Museum of the Royal Irish Academy, and am the possessor of about as many more; but the array of material is still so far from sufficient for grounding generalizations, that in what I shall have to say, regarding those more immediately under our notice, I must confine myself rather to indicating paths of inquiry, than to announcing results.

I do not, however, apply this caution to the general process of transliteration. It is impossible to contemplate the agreement between the Latin and Ogham legends found side by side, on not less than seven bilingual examples in South Wales and in Ireland, without recognizing the substantial accuracy of the ordinary Ogham key, and feeling assured that, wherever we possess a complete text, uncomplicated by intentional obscurations, we will be safe in assigning the key-values to most, if not all, of the characters.



Unhappily, the two great legends preserved by you and Mr. Graves from entire destruction at Dunbel, and which form, indeed, the pride of your Museum, have been so far injured by the ignorant violence done them before your intervention, that some of the vowel-points are undistinguishable, and others uncertain. Still, the legends are complete, in possessing all their consonants, and in having, each, a definite beginning and end; and one at least allies itself, in both the names or tituli recorded in it, with other examples in Ogham and in Latin nomenclature.

This legend, which I shall call No. 1, extends the full length of the stone, and is destitute of the well-known formula 'Maqi,' which in most cases serves as a catch-word to show the direction of the reading. We are consequently left to determine from which end the transliteration ought to commence, by tentative means. Reading in one direction we obtain—

Saffalloffenittac,

which, offering no analogy to known combinations, we may put aside, and try the same process from the other end. Here the result is more satisfactory. It reads, the minuscules marking what is questionable and alternative—

SAFFiQEGI TT<sup>o</sup><sub>uu</sub> <sup>da</sup><sub>e</sub> ATTAC.

At i, there may be either six or five notches. If six, the reading might be UU, or, which would be more likely, EO; recalling the SAFEI of the Killeen Cormaic bilingual.

At <sup>o</sup><sub>uu</sub> room exists for the lower combination; but the upper is all that is now apparent.

At <sup>da</sup><sub>e</sub>, the spacing indicates the upper combination; the context very strongly suggests the lower. Having regard to other Ogham legends conceived in the same form—

Gosoctismosacma,  
Carrtaccgaqimucagma,  
Curcitifindilorac,(?)

it would seem that the legend should divide itself into the two names or tituli—

SAFFIQEGI TTO<sup>DD</sup><sub>e</sub> ATTAC

SAFFIQEGI at once recalls the SFAQQUCI of the Fardel monument. TTODDATAC has so strong a general resemblance to the various forms in which the Irish historical name Toictheg presents itself, in annals and in



Ogham-inscribed Stone from Dunbel.—No. 1.



lapidary engraving, and in Latin as well as in Ogham characters, that one does not hesitate to recognize it as substantially the same: and, indeed, it may be that what exists is the remains neither of *dd* nor of *c* but of an original *gg*, the lower halves of which have been obliterated, giving the name in its normal form, *Ttoggattac*. This duplication of letters is not peculiar to Ogham writing. In his latest contribution to Celtic learning, Dr. Whitley Stokes gives us examples of Welsh MS. glosses of the eighth or ninth century as thickly beset with this affectation as the text before us. The other forms in which the name appears are *Toictheach* and *Toicthuic* in manuscript, and *Togittacc* in Ogham sculpture. Compare *Toc-toc*, on a Gaulish coin of the Sequani (Anatole de Barthelemy in 'Revue Celtique,' Vol. I., p. 298.) [But see an example of the name substantially as in the Dunbel text, and seemingly used in a disparaging sense, in Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, c. 41, "De quodam Lugneo guberneta, cognomento *TUBIDA*, quem sua conjux odio habuerat." Reeves, p. 164. And see on the Ogham-inscribed fragment in Mus. Lap. R. I. A., No. 12, after groups spelling *Muco*, the characters yielding what may be read as *TUCACADD*, or possibly as *TUDDADDAC*.]

Gosoct's *Smosacma*, Cartagac's *Mucagma*, Curcit's *Findilorac*, Sfaccuc's *Toicthec*—if these really be the true readings—add a curious category to inscriptional formulas. It is as if, instead of saying John son of Thomas, we should say Thomas's John, a form of expression still, I believe, in use in the Northern English counties, and on the Border. Of *SAFFIQEGI* I shall only add that, whatever its signification, it casts the first ray of a reflected light on the 'Sfaqquci' of the Fardel monument, hitherto involved in the same total darkness that still invests the 'Maqiqici' of the same legend. I have some reason to believe that the latter will be also found to be reflected from Irish lapidary texts.

No. 2. The second of the Dunbel monuments. This has suffered irreparable injury in some of the vowel-groups. Yet it is wonderful with what success the fragments have been collected and placed together. It is conceived in the ordinary Johnson-of-Thomas form, and reads—



Ogham-inscribed Stone from Dunbel.—No. 2.

## BR N TTASMAQIDOCR DDA.

Branittas Maqi Docredda seems the likeliest restoration. It is hard to believe that the patronymic is not the well-known 'Deccedda;' but the continuation of the digits, making R, is traceable, notwithstanding much fracture of the surface. Compare the subject-name (Branittas, Barnittas, Baranittas, or whatever the right vocalization may be), with 'Cassittas.' Compare also with 'Cunitti,' and consider whether differences of gender may not be indicated by the different forms of inflexion.

No. 3. This is also a fragment, brought from the sea shore in the neighbourhood of Fethard, in Wexford. It has originally been a very fine example of those long, rounded, and smooth pillar-stones which might with propriety be called pulvinarian, that have been found in no other place, so far as I know, save here and in the neighbourhood of Dingle. Nothing can be imagined more lasting in lapidary art than the indentations cut on these hard and smooth surfaces. Unfortunately, this pillar has been broken across, and we possess only one end of the double line of Oghams originally engraved along it. These, at one side, indicate some such name as CONMACOS, or CORBMACOS, the 'macos' being the only certain portion. At the other side, the digits remaining might read CELAQ, but are also capable of various other combinations, as we read from one side or the other, or as from a beginning, or as to an end. All, in the absence of the context, must rest in conjecture, that friend, yet enemy, of discovery; which, like fire, is the worst of masters, although in its inductive function, as necessary to knowledge as fire to the service of life.

No. 4. An Ogham-inscribed stone found in a crannoge in the county of Fermanagh, and presented by Mr. Wakeman, who has described and figured it in your Society's 'Journal'<sup>1</sup> for January, 1871. It is, I believe, the most northern of those cryptic lapidary remains hitherto discovered in Ireland. There can be no doubt that it originally bore a legend in Ogham characters. The seemingly initial letter B and what may be an L, or the remains of a combination of more numerous digits, are conspicuous; and it may with some confidence be suggested that the terminal letters were UU. The traces of lost characters may be distinguished in the intervals between the more deeply cut digits which still strike the eye. The indentation taken for H in the penultimate seems to be an erosion of the surface. Such also I would take to be those traces above the line which, if this were a name compounded in 'Cu,' as Bealcu, for example, would stand for the C. The whole legend is, indeed, tantalizing from its near approach to the known, while it nowhere passes out of the obscure.

No. 5. The Gowran inscription. This large block, which, owing to fractures destructive of its original outline, has a rude resemblance to a coffin, lies flat on the ground. That such was intended to be its normal position, I infer from the Ogham characters being confined to its upper arrises, and carried round its lower end. A boldly cut cross occupies the upper and broader portion of the surface: the back is left rough as it came from the quarry. The extremities of the cross are crutch-headed. The arris of both sides, at the upper or broader end, has been chipped away, so as to cut across the outline of the arms. The Ogham digits which

---

<sup>1</sup> Fourth series, Vol. I., p. 368.



mark the line of the original arris, come up at both sides to the commencement of the chipping. If the arris, so marked, were prolonged, especially on the more deeply fractured side of the stone, it would fall within the outline of the cross. Hence, it might be inferred that, as the Ogham follows a line, the prolongation of which would trench on the outline of the cross, as originally sculptured, the cross existed on the stone before the Ogham. It seems, however, possible, though less likely, that the chipping may have obliterated both the ends of the cross and the conterminous digits at the same time. I do not know of any authority for the statement generally received with respect to crosses sculptured on Ogham-inscribed stones,—that the early Christians were in the habit of marking inscribed Pagan monuments with the sign of the cross. The cross-signed Ogham monuments are very numerous. Mr. Hitchcock, in his list in the Library of the Academy, enumerates twenty-two instances. I have, myself, seen most of them, besides many others in which the cross appears to be part of the sculptured design; and I have never observed anything in these to indicate a difference of age (except, perhaps, in the particular instance before us, in favour of the antiquity of the cross), between the inscribed symbol and the accompanying characters. It is true, on the ‘Trengus’ stone, at Cilgerran, a later-cut cross appears on the side of the column, but it forms no part of the general design, as it appears to do in the large class of instances to which I have referred. I may observe, that two Ogham-inscribed stones, which seem to commemorate ‘Ailiter,’ or pilgrims, bear the Maltese cross, and that one of the most interesting drawings left by Mr. DuNoyer is of an inscribed monument at St. Gobbinet’s, in Cork, which represents a pilgrim, staff in hand, pacing over the convexity of the world represented by a circle filled with a cross of this design.

Its shape, its inscribed cross, and its site, make it difficult for any one looking at this Gowran monument to imagine it otherwise than sepulchral and Christian. Its Ogham legend has been greatly mutilated, but contains one recognizable formula which serves as a guide to the reading of the south or right hand side, from the top towards the bottom. Whether it terminates there or proceeds in one course up the opposite side is hardly possible to determine. If it proceed in a uniform sequence the remains of the text would be represented thus:—

$\frac{d}{g}$  M A Q O M U C O      i N      *d d a C i S A R E I g q i.*

again, using minuscules for obscure and alternative characters, and *Italicised* minuscules for the more doubtful.

The form assumed by the terminal group renders it improbable that this reading, as regards the right-hand arris, can be the true one. Varying the direction for this side, and reading, as on the south side, in a downward sequence, we obtain what still seems an unlikely combination—

*i n g I E R A C i S a l l.*

Neither will the case be helped by reading up; unless we do so, as in the case of the Camp inscription, in an inverse order; and here it may be possible that we have the elements of some such name as Lazareni in the amplified form characteristic of the paper as well as lapidary writings of the early centuries of our era—

Lla S <sup>as</sup>/<sub>i</sub> C A R E i g n i.

When the Bishop of Limerick pointed out that the Ollacon of the Ballinasteenig monument is only the amplified genitive of Ollu, and that Ogham names were formed *from* the ordinary name according to certain rules and methods, he furnished a key to much of the seeming mystery of these legends. Dr. Whitley Stokes went a step further in his publication of the tract called the *Duil Laithne*, showing how the enlargement was effected by the interpolation of extraneous syllables in several classes of words preserved in ancient manuscripts. With these lights one sees at a glance that such names, for example, as Maglocunus and Cunemagulus are the familiar Milcon and Cumael in their syllabic state attire. Cassibelanus and Divitiacus are but Caswallon and plain Duftac puffed out by a like process. Even down to the time of Bede, we find something of the same character:—as Ceollach, for Cellagh, (3-21;) and Meilochon, for Mailcuin, (3-4.) Similarly, we find the known name Lamidan, in the genitive, Lamidagni, lying hid under the magnified disguise of Lamitaidagni, in the Kilbonane legend; and may be pretty confident that some such name as Nireman is concealed under the associated Niremnaqagni of the same inscription; but why the process should have been effected in the one case by inserting *tai*, and in the other by inserting *naq*, has not yet appeared, any more than why, in the *Duil Laithne*, the same sort of disguises should be produced by inserting *ose*, *anc*, *nro*, or *ros*. From what Bishop Graves has intimated, it is possible that he has divined, and may yet inform us of, some rule or principle governing the introduction of these syllabic superfetations, and guiding us to their rejection. Judging from the examples of the practice—it was called *Formolad*—published by Stokes, it would appear to have been hardly worthy of being deemed an artifice of grammar, but rather a trick of verbal disguises depending on the caprice of the writer. But there is nothing to limit the period to which it may have reached back; and, certainly, considering the extraordinary forms in which some of the Gaulish names have been handed down to us, there is room for reasonable question whether, in seeking to account for them on grammatical principles, a large amount of learning has not been expended *in vacuo*. But it would be presumptuous to speculate on what hereafter may be the judgment of competent philologists on the Vercingetorixes and Conconnetodumnuses of the Commentaries. Suffice it that here, at home, we have syllabic groups as formidable to all appearance, in these Ogham legends, which, disburthened of the stuffing of their *formolads*, become recognisable as known old Irish names, and that, if the known name Lazarenius, in its genitive case, have, in this particular instance, been swelled into these seeming traces of Llasaicareigni, there would be nothing out of analogy with other examples, in that reading.

But the traces of the obscure letters are extremely faint, and any reading of this side of the Gowran legend must belong rather to conjecture than assurance.<sup>1</sup>

---

[<sup>1</sup> An inspection of a photograph of the cast from this legend recently taken induces me to think that I have spoken here

with undue diffidence. But I would now incline to reduce the initial to one L.]



As regards the left side, the long hiatus after Muco has been occasioned by a chipping of the edge, done apparently with the object of obliterating the characters. The arris is not chipped away continuously, as would have been done to fit the block for bedding in a course of masonry, but is broken off in separate indentations, as if with the design of striking away particular characters. Still, enough of the ordinary formula 'Maqo Mucoi' remains to assure us that the whole of it was formerly there, and that the reading, from above downward, which yields that sequence of characters is in the right direction. But you will ask, what is this common formula 'Maqo' or 'Maqi Mucoi,' and what does it mean? Here, I avow myself unable to do more than set before you what I know bearing, or seeming to bear, on the subject, leaving conclusions open as I find them. This formula 'Maqi Mucoi,' then, is almost as ubiquitous as 'Maqi' itself; and, first, in reference to 'Maqi' it may be observed that it occupies a place of such extraordinary prominence in these legends, is so often duplicated, and occurs in contexts of such a nature as to make it extremely difficult to regard it as a mere predicate of a subject-name in an ordinary pedigree. I, just now, in illustration of the name Tuictheg, referred to the name Togittac in the Cahernagat inscription—

Togittacc Maqi Sagarettos.

If we consider this in what seems its equivalent Latin form—

Togitacus Filii Sacerdos,

the possible meaning of 'Maqi,' in some at least of these contexts, may be better understood. 'Mucoi,' however, is generally found in what seems a genitive form, so that whether it is predicated of 'Maqi,' or 'Maqi' of it, cannot be determined by any test of grammar. Hitherto, it has always been received as the [object] whatever its meaning may be. At first it was thought to be a tribe-name; but the formula was found to be too widely extended for any name of a family. Afterwards it was taken to be a designation of the *status* of the person named in the paronymic, as A son of the Swineherd B. But the difficulty of supposing all the persons whose callings were worth notice, to have been swineherds, and the constantly widening area over which the formula is found to extend, have led to the rejection of that construction, and the substitution for it of another, A son of the Rich-in-swine B, which, however, seems open to the same objection. A writer in the 'Cork Examiner,' at an early stage of the inquiry, suggested that 'Mucoi' was equivalent to the Irish for 'holy'; which, if well grounded, would be an acceptable solution of the difficulty; but his Irish does not meet the acceptance of Celtic scholars; and, indeed, in one instance at the old church of Seskinan, in Waterford, the formula, whatever it may signify, appears—I speak on the authority of Mr. Brash, who has examined it attentively—in the uninflected form 'Maqi Muc,' which can hardly be rendered otherwise than 'Filii Porcus,' and cannot be reconciled with any form of the suggested Irish, which only resembles the word in its inflected aspects. Obviously, the true meaning remains to be discovered; and, in aid of further investigation, I shall set down three matters deserving attention. First, when the boundary of the lands of Kirkness and Lochore, in Fife, was in dispute between Robert Burgoyne and the Celedei of Lochleven, one of the arbiters was Dufgal 'filius

*Mocche*, a description which seems to savour rather of an order than of a family affiliation;<sup>1</sup> and here I would observe that, if 'Maqi Mocoli' and 'Maqi Decedda' be anything in the nature of tribe-names, the tribes must be considered rather as families in religion than as lay relations; for no other kind of family could send its members so widely over both islands. Leaving Dufgal 'Maqi Mocche' for such consideration as he may be deemed worthy of, I shall [secondly] next notice, more in detail, a matter which I ventured to glance at in a communication on this subject, read some time ago, at the Royal Irish Academy. The accomplished French inscriptionist, Edmond Le Blant, in the '*Revue Archæologique*' (N. S. x., p. 5), in a valuable paper, entitled *Sur quelques noms bizarres adoptés par les premiers Chrétiens*, has shown that, prior to the eighth century, pious—perhaps it would be better to say, fanatic—Christians were in the habit of assuming names of self-reproach and humiliation, such as, from amongst his examples:—

|                |             |
|----------------|-------------|
| Contumeliosus, | Fœdulus,    |
| Injurius,      | Maliciosus, |
| Importunus,    | Molesta,    |
| Malus,         | Pecus,      |
| Exitiosus,     | Fimus,      |
| Calumniosus,   | Stercus,    |
| Insapientia,   | Stercoreus. |

In respect of the two last names, Le Blandt's statement that they were names of reproach has, strangely enough, been called in question; but a reference to Du Cange, under 'Concagatum,' will, I think, dispel any doubt on that subject. We find, in some of the Ogham texts, already decyphered, what seem to be indications of a practice of the same nature among those, whoever they were, for whom those memorials were written. 'Malus' has its counterpart in 'Corb' (Seskinan) and 'Olean' (Glanavullin); Fœdulus is repeated in 'Turpill' (Crickhowell); 'Insapientia' seems to be reflected in 'Amadu' (Ardmore); and the latter designations appear to have their counterpart in 'Caqosus' (Ballintaggart). To these I might add the recently observed legend at Donard, in Wicklow, which, if read retroversely, yields 'Iniqui.' If these be real, and not merely seeming agreements, it might not unnaturally be expected that 'Pecus' also should have its representatives: and that names of vilification were in fact known to Irish Antiquaries to be concealed under Ogham texts—a fact strongly attesting the reality of the resemblances which I have noticed—appears from the following, which I submit as an important statement of Mac Curtin. In his treatise on Ogham writing, he says: 'It was penal for any but those that were sworn Antiquaries to study or read the same. For in these characters those sworn Antiquaries wrote all the evil actions and other vicious practices of their Monarchs and other great Personages, both male and female, that it might not be known to any but themselves, and their successors, being sworn Antiquaries as aforesaid.'<sup>2</sup> I do not know Mac Curtin's authority for this statement; but the statement itself is not

<sup>1</sup> Reeves' Culdees, App. 130. "Transactions" Royal Irish Academy.

<sup>2</sup> Irish Gram., c. 14, appended to "Dictionary," p. 714.



one which any person would be likely to invent, neither was Mac Curtin a man to whom dishonesty of this kind could justly be imputed. One cannot look at the careful obliteration of many such legends without a suspicion that some of the names removed have been of this class, and belonged to the period when these excesses of ascetic zeal were present in the neighbouring churches of Western Europe. The terms which, in such a point of view, would answer to 'pecus' are Muc (porcus), Rette (Caper), and, I imagine, Birrotais, (Sus parturiens, San. Corm.); but it is difficult to conceive that one aiming at self-abasement would impute the reproach to the parent, or that 'Maqi' in such cases could be regarded as governing the associated genitive. And this seems the proper point for introducing [thirdly], *valeat quantum*, the opinion of Algernon Herbert as to the meaning of the *Hoianau*, or verses beginning 'Listen, little Pig,' and other porcellan allusions in old Welsh mystical poetry. I know the great danger one risks in trusting to any conclusions of this most learned but visionary writer. He conceived, as you are aware, that after the departure of the Romans from Britain, a form of what he call Neo-Druidism developed itself in the early Christian Church of these islands. With what arguments he has sustained his views may be seen by consulting his 'Britannia after the Romans,' his 'Neo-Druidic Heresy' and 'Cyclops Christianus,' all very vague, mystical, and unsatisfying efforts of what one must admit, all the while, to be a very acute mind stored with remarkable rarities of learning. What he says,<sup>1</sup> then, respecting the members of his supposed corrupt British Church of the fourth century, is this:—'In the language of the Neo-Druidic heresy, its members were swine, and the inferior members little pigs. It is a symbol or metaphor entirely peculiar to the defection from the true faith wrought in this island, and spread in Ireland.' His fuller exposition will be found in his 'Neo-Druidic Heresy,' at pages 118-124. He there insists that traces of this peculiarity existed in the Bardic schools of Wales down to the eleventh century, instancing the title '*Prydydd y Moch*,' or *Poet of the Pigs*, given to Lywarch ap Llwelyn, a bard of that period. This may, or may not be, illusory. But if the whole fabric be not a baseless vision, we should conclude that 'Filii Porcus' would be more consonant to reason than 'Filius Porci.' We have had an instance of what seems to all reasonable apprehension to be 'Filii Sacerdos.' If it should appear on further search that other orders, degrees, or offices of an early Christianity are expressed in these legends, and that not in dependence on, but governing the associated 'Maqi,' it would go far to account for this wide spread formula, on grounds not repugnant to the philosophy of language or of history. The degree of Presbyter is actually recorded on one of these monuments, that of Sacerdos on another, that of Chore-bishop, to all appearance, on a third; the designation of Pilgrim, probably, on a fourth; the grade of Sapiens on a fifth; and the relation of *Cele* on a sixth. The wide-spread 'Decedda,' bears a remarkable likeness to *Dean* in its original form of a president of ten. Should further inquiry add substantially to these evidences, the general conclusion could hardly be avoided, that Ogham-inscribed stones are, in the main, Christian monuments. But it does not appear to be necessary to believe

---

<sup>1</sup> "Brit. after the Romans," p. 108.

with Mr. Herbert, even though we accepted 'Maqi Mucoi' as equivalent to 'Christi de grege porcus,' either that there had been any defection from the true faith in the Christianity with which we should believe the formula to be associated, or that it was of a date in any way dependent on the departure of the Romans from Britain.

It would be difficult to conceive of an inquiry more attractive to the historical and philosophic student, than would be opened up by finding authentic remains of those 'Scoti in Christo credentes' for whose government—possibly for whose correction—Palladius was sent hither in A.D. 429. Yet it is within the bounds of a reasonable probability that among some of these Ogham legends we may find material for that investigation. Consider, in this connection, the existence of those populations called *Cagots* and *Caqueux*, in France, and *Marrans*, or swine, in the adjoining districts of Spain, who used to enter church by a separate door, and sit apart at worship, and whose burying-grounds, like the Ogham-bearing *Killeens* of Ireland, were regarded as unfit for the reception of the general dead; and compare the supposed reason for their isolation, (that they formerly were lepers,) with the possible solution in old ecclesiastical antipathies, suggested as well by what has been said above as by the fact of their being designated contumeliously by the derisive name of *Chrestiaas*. ('Hist. des Races Maudits de la France et de l'Espagne,' per Francisque-Michel, Paris, Franck. 1847.)

Certainly no one can overlook the essential difference between the *oroit ar*, and *oroit do* of the Irish conventional Christian inscriptions of the seventh and succeeding centuries, and the simple patronymical record of the Ogham formula—A son of B, without admitting a presumption that they belong, if not to different developments, at least to different periods of Christianity in Ireland.

Reverting to the word 'Mucoi,' it is rarely found unaccompanied by a preceding 'Maqi.' One example of its exceptional use, so far as the position of the stone bearing the inscription enables me to judge, is in that legend at the old Church of Claragh, of your own discovery—

Tasegagni Mucoi Maqr [ette?].

It is much to be desired that this stone should be taken out of the gable of the church in which it is now imbedded too deeply to admit of its characters being further traced or reproduced in a paper-cast. It might, if not inscribed on the back, be replaced with such a projection from the face of the wall as would expose all its Ogham-bearing arrises.

Respecting the wide extension of the formula 'Maqi Mucoi,' Mr. Brash has recently, in correcting an erroneous reading of my own, recognized it for the first time in Britain, on the Ogham legend at Bridell, in Pembrokeshire. Had its presence on that monument been known to Mr. Herbert, it would have been a substantial addition to his proofs.

I cannot conclude without expressing my admiration for the zeal which has assembled so many objects of high archæological interest in your Museum, and secured for those objects means of exhibition so commodious and even elegant. To have achieved these ends in a provincial city of Ireland bespeaks eminent ability, and a noble ardour in the pursuit of knowledge. Kilkenny has now been made as distinguished a centre



of solid and manly learning, as it used to be of bright and genial social influences. With cordial good wishes for your continued success in cherishing the lamp of letters, I am,

Dear Sir, your obliged and faithful Servant,

SAMUEL FERGUSON.

JOHN G. A. PRIM, ESQ.

*Kilkenny.*

POSTSCRIPT.—Just as this letter is about being signed for the press, the Bishop of Limerick makes me the medium of communicating to the Academy an Ogham inscription of singularly Christian purport, now (I believe) in the garden of the Christian Brothers at Caherciveen; and grounds upon it not only a particular (and, as it seems to me, an unanswerable) argument for its comparatively modern date, but also certain generalizations contributory of at least two new elements to the Ogham Glossary. Bishop Graves, when acquainted with but three examples of the initial formula *Anm*, twenty years ago equated it with *Anima*: and now, having ten examples to support his conclusion, declares himself convinced that such is the proper reading. He adds, what falls in very acceptably with the examples of humiliatory formulas above given, the expression *Atmaqi* in *pejori sensu*.

S. F.

*Dublin, 11th November, 1872.*

